```
Case 2:09-cv-00966-HDM-LRL Document 116 Filed 07/26/11 Page 1 of 2
 1
2
3
4
 5
6
7
8
9
10
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11
                             DISTRICT OF NEVADA
12
13
   RONALD NEAL JOSEPH, SR.,
   et al.
14
              Plaintiffs,
                                        2:09-cv-00966-HDM-LRL
15
   VS.
16
                                        ORDER
   LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE )
17
   DEPARTMENT, et al.
18
              Defendants.
19
        On July 22, 2011, plaintiffs filed a motion for telephonic
20
   hearing (Docket No. 114) on defendants' motion for summary judgment
21
   (Docket No. 73). On July 25, 2011, defendants filed a motion to
22
   strike (Docket No. 115) plaintiffs' motion for telephonic hearing
23
   (Docket No. 114) on defendants' motion for summary judgment (Docket
24
   No. 73). Plaintiffs' motion for a telephonic hearing (Docket No.
25
   114) is ripe.
26
        Plaintiffs' motion for a telephonic hearing (Docket No. 114)
```

is essentially a "sur-reply" to defendants' motion for summary 1 2 judgment (Docket No. 73). The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 3 Local Rule 7-2 govern the filing of dispositive motions and 4 responsive pleadings. Local Rule 7-2 allows the filing of a 5 motion, a response by the opposing party and a reply by the moving 6 party. Sur-replies are not permitted without leave of the court. See Sattari v. CitiMortgage, 2011 WL 1103403, \*2 (D.Nev. March 23, 8 2011) (citing Garrison v. Northeast Ga. Med. Ctr., Inc., 66 F. 9 Supp. 2d 1336, 1340 (N.D.Ga. 1999)). Based on the foregoing, 10 defendants request that the court strike the legal arguments set 11 forth in plaintiffs' motion for a telephonic hearing. (See Docket No. 115) 12

The court hereby GRANTS defendants' motion to strike (Docket No. 115) the legal arguments set forth in plaintiffs' motion for a telephonic hearing (Docket No. 114) which relate to the motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 73).

The court GRANTS that portion of plaintiffs' motion (Docket No. 114) requesting a telephonic hearing on the motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 73) and schedules a telephonic hearing on the motion (Docket No. 73) on August 11, 2011, at 10:00 a.m.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 26th day of July, 2011.

23

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Howard DMEKiller